

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,297	04/12/2001	Jeffrey A. Bluestone	GNN-014CP 4765	
959	7590 03/04/2004	EXAMINER		
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP. 28 STATE STREET			ROARK, JESSICA H	
BOSTON, MA 02109			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1644	

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(a)	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Fire military Initiate of Internations Symmony	09/835,297	BLUESTONE ET AL.	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jessica H. Roark	1644	
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_	
(1) <u>Jessica H. Roark</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Megan E. Williams</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 4 March 2004	Time:		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed:			
Prior art documents discussed: none			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENEI See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate of directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate of did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar 	e examiner will provide a writt record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview.	
4 00 /			
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	/Applicant's Representative S	ignature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called to determine if a response had been filed to the Restriction Requirement mailed 8/19/03. Applicant's representative indicated no Restriction Requirement had been received. Inspection of the file revealed that the Restriction Requirement had been mailed to an incorrect address. The Examiner indicated the Restriction Requirement would be re-mailed to the correct address and the response period restarted.

The period for response therefore begins with the date of re-mailing. .